



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The importance of Suidas' information regarding the deserters from the army of Cyrus is slight. It draws attention to a situation which, though implied in the *Anabasis*, has escaped the notice of the editors. The marked difference between the estimates of numbers would seem to indicate that the deserters did not leave the army in a body at one time, though the bulk of them were doubtless encouraged by the example of Zenias and Pasion to desert at Myriandrus.

ROBERT J. BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### NOTE ON HERODOTUS 1. 60

Herodotus' indignant and spluttering protest against the foolishness that staged the home-coming of Peisistratus under the guidance of an impersonated Athena is one of the best-known and most frequently quoted passages of the *Histories*:

Ἐνδεξαμένον δὲ τὸν λόγον καὶ ὁμολογήσαντος ἐπὶ τούτοις Πεισιστράτου μηχανῶνται δὴ ἐπὶ τῇ κατόδῳ πρῆγμα εὐηθέστατον, ὥς ἐγὼ εὐρίσκω, μακρῷ, ἐπεὶ γε ἀπεκρίθη ἐκ παλαιτέρου τοῦ βαρβάρου ἔθνεος τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐὼν καὶ δεξιώτερον καὶ εὐηθείης ἡλιθίου ἀπηλλαγμένον μᾶλλον, εἰ καὶ τότε γε οὗτοι ἐν Ἀθηναίοις τοῖσι πρώτοις λεγομένοις εἶναι Ἑλλήνων σοφίην μηχανῶνται τοιαῦδε.

The expression of Herodotus' argumentative disgust, manifested by the repetition of *γε*, is slightly anacoluthic and will not construe smoothly. It must be felt in the Greek words in the Greek order. He begins by saying that he takes it to be the "silliest thing ever." The *ἐπεὶ γε* clause might have served as the sole reason or justification of that statement. It was an imbecile proceeding to "put such a thing over" on a Greek population, because the Greeks had from of old been distinguished from the barbarians as cleverer and more free from that kind of foolish simple-mindedness. That isn't strong enough to satisfy Herodotus' feeling. He adds the a fortiori argument that the trick was tried on the Athenians, the most intelligent of the Greeks. And this introduced by *εἰ . . . γε* becomes in accordance with Greek and Herodotean usage of *εἰ . . . γε* the main confirmation of the preceding *εὐηθέστατον*, and so the *ἐπεὶ γε* clause becomes a sort of anacoluthic parenthesis.

But why am I thus painfully explicit? Because I find little agreement among the interpreters of the passage, and one of the greatest seems to me to have gone farthest astray. In Professor Wilamowitz' *Aristoteles und Athen*, II, 10, the words are translated as follows: "da ersinnen sie etwas, worin ich nur die kolossalste Naivetät finden kann, die ich kenne. In der Tat, die Barbaren müssen sich schon früher von den Hellenen darin unterschieden haben, dass sie gewitziger und freier von kindischer Einfalt

waren, wenn damals die Peisistratiden unter den Athenern, die doch für die gescheidtesten der Hellenen gelten, folgendes ersinnen durften."

And on the faith of this translation we are asked to believe that Herodotus meant that "so etwas war in Memphis und Sardis nicht möglich." Being free from the pride of race which modern critics foist upon him, he recognized the intellectual superiority of the barbarian to the old-fashioned Greek.

This rendering of course assumes the reading of  $\text{APc } \tau\omicron \beta \acute{\alpha} \rho \beta \alpha \rho \omicron \nu \xi \theta \nu \omicron \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \text{ Ἑλληνικοῦ}$ . There are several objections to the interpretation. To begin with, though Herodotus may have idealized some barbarian institutions or traits by way of satirizing his contemporaries, he did not and could not believe that the barbarians were of superior intelligence to the Greeks. Cf. for example the whole tone of the speech in 9. 79. Secondly, the resulting logic is very strained. The argument would run: "The act was very silly because the barbarians are more intelligent than the Greeks, as appears from the fact that the Athenians, the cleverest of the Greeks, could be thus deceived"—an extremely lame and improbable sequence. Wilamowitz disguises the difficulty with his "in der Tat" and his "doch," which are not in the Greek.

But even if for argument's sake we should waive these two points, the natural and normal use of both  $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \acute{\iota} \gamma \epsilon$  and  $\epsilon \dot{\iota} . . . \gamma \epsilon$  is incompatible with Wilamowitz' interpretation. In 1. 146 for example  $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \acute{\iota} . . . \gamma \epsilon$  is used to justify the dogmatic affirmation of the foolishness of the opponent's view. Cf. 5. 88. Similar uses are common in the drama and elsewhere. Cf. Sophocles' *Antigone* 923; *O.C.* 266; *Philoct.* 446; Plato *Symp.* 208 C:  $\kappa \alpha \iota \eta, \omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \omicron \dot{\iota} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omicron \nu \sigma \phi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\iota}$ ,  $\text{E}\ddot{\nu} \text{ } \iota \sigma \theta \iota, \xi \phi \eta, \ddot{\omega} \text{ } \Sigma \acute{\omega} \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \varsigma; \epsilon \pi \epsilon \acute{\iota} \gamma \epsilon, \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$ , and *Republic* 352 C.

For the force of  $\epsilon \dot{\iota} . . . \gamma \epsilon$  cf. Herod. 4. 97, where  $\epsilon \dot{\iota}$  alone is used to introduce a confirmation of the writer's argument. In 7. 10  $\beta$  the addition of  $\gamma \epsilon$  marks the sharper controversial tone, and in 7. 46 it marks, if not precisely controversy, greater intensity of feeling. In 4. 195  $\delta \kappa \omicron \nu \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota}$  performs the same function as  $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota}$ . In 9. 68 and 9. 100  $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota} \tau \acute{o} \tau \epsilon$  recur with the force I have attributed to them here in 1. 60.

The Herodotean use of  $\epsilon \dot{\iota} . . . \gamma \epsilon$  is found in Sophocles *O.T.* 383, where Jebb has no note, but with instinctive right feeling introduces a confirmatory "yea" into his translation. It is found also in Euripides' *Medea* 88:  $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \tau \acute{o} \upsilon \sigma \delta \epsilon \gamma' \epsilon \dot{\iota} \nu \eta \varsigma \epsilon \dot{\iota} \nu \epsilon \kappa' \omicron \ddot{\upsilon} \sigma \tau \acute{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota \pi \alpha \tau \acute{\eta} \rho$ , where Earle's note quite misses the point. He says: "The contempt is heightened by the sneering  $\gamma \epsilon$ —these mere children," and cites as a parallel Sophocles *O.T.* 383. Verrall rightly renders "when . . . seeing that, introducing a proof of a principle before laid down." Similarly Headlam: " $\epsilon \dot{\iota} . . . \gamma \epsilon$  as often states the instance relied on to justify a conclusion, 'inasmuch as.'" Similarly in effect Wecklein, Thompson and Mills, Fischl, Allen, von Arnim and Weil. It is superfluous to quote other examples. It is obvious that in our

passage the *εἰ καὶ τότε γε* clause is a further confirmation of the judgment *εὐηθέστατον*.

For the rest, this passage has been strangely dealt with. I cannot conceive what Howe and Wells mean by their note, p. 83: "*ἐπεὶ* is to be taken closely with *τότε γε*, at that time when the Greek race had long been separated."

Ruskin, *Queen of the Air*, 45, is as pleased as the Athenian of Plato's Laws would have affected to be with the childlike faith of the Athenian peasants: "In Athens, itself the centre of thought and refinement, Peisistratus obtained the reins of government through the ready belief of the populace that a beautiful woman armed like Athena was the goddess herself." Thomson, *The Greek Tradition*, p. 142 writes: "They could only learn by sloughing one cortex after another of intellectual sloth and helplessness and naïveté and niaiserie. Herodotus calls the process getting rid of silly simplicity." I do not wish to be hypercritical, but this is overinterpretation in the interests of a theory. Herodotus is not thinking of the history of rationalism. He is merely expressing his own intense distaste for the irrationality of such a performance at Athens of all places. The colorless use of *ἀπηλλαγμένον* is not to be pressed to yield a generalized description of a historical process. I am not quite sure whether Herodotus meant further to imply that the trick was silly because he didn't believe that the Athenians themselves believed in it. That would be a conceivable interpretation roughly illustrated by the grins with which the populace of Siena today receive the formal blessing in their churches of the horses that are to run in the midsummer races.

PAUL SHOREY